

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in the present patent application. Claims 1-33 stand rejected. This application continues to include claims 1-33.

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Boldt, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,349,304 B1 (hereinafter, Boldt). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-33 in view of the following.

Boldt is directed to configuring devices over a network with settings and, in particular, copying the settings from one network device, such as a network printer, to a plurality of network devices, such as printers (col. 1, lines 12-14). Boldt discloses that at block 46, a list of printers is displayed, and that at block 48, the user selects printers as targets from those displayed (col. 8, lines 11-24, Fig. 8). At block 50, groups of features 26 associated with the selected source are displayed, and at block 52, the user selects one or more groups of features 26 (col. 8, lines 25-33, Fig. 8). At block 56, the source and target printers, and the values for the selected features are displayed, and at block 58, the user selects the “Finish” button to begin the process of copying values for the selected features to the target printers (col. 8, lines 34-47, Fig. 8), which is performed as a loop from block 60 to block 72 for each target printer (col. 9, lines 23-26, Fig. 8).

At block 60, the computer selects a target printer, and at block 64, transmits a query over the network to determine if the target printer supports both the selected feature and the source value for the selected feature (col. 8, lines 50-65, Fig. 8). After determining which of the values are supported at the target printer, at block 66 the computer configures the target printer with the selected group of features that are available at the target printer (col. 9, lines

3-8, Fig. 8). At block 68, the computer maintains information indicating values for the selected features not copied to the target printer, and at block 70 the computer determines if there are any unconfigured printers left, wherein if so, control transfers to block 72 to loop back to block 60 until all target printers are configured (col. 9, lines 17-26, Fig. 8).

Applicants believe that claims 1-33 patentably define Applicants' invention over Boldt, for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of establishing a plurality of target device settings for at least one target device based on a plurality of source device settings of a source device via a network. Claim 1 recites, in part, writing each setting of said plurality of source device settings to said at least one target device; and generating an invalid setting indication for each setting not accepted by said at least one target device.

In contrast to writing each setting of the plurality of source device settings to the at least one target device; and subsequently generating an invalid setting indication for each setting not accepted by the at least one target device, Boldt discloses that at block 60, the computer selects a target printer, and at block 64, transmits a query over the network to determine if the target printer supports both the selected feature and the source value for the selected feature (col. 8, lines 50-65, Fig. 8). After determining which of the values are supported at the target printer, at block 66 the computer configures the target printer with the selected group of features that are available at the target printer (col. 9, lines 3-8, Fig. 8).

Thus, Boldt discloses querying whether the selected feature and source value are supported by the target printer (block 60) before configuring the target printer. However, Applicants' invention of claim 1 generates an invalid setting indication for each setting not

accepted after writing the plurality of source device settings to the target device. Hence, Applicants' use of the phrase, generating an invalid setting indication for each setting not accepted by the at least one target device.

In addition, Boldt simply does not disclose, teach, or suggest a setting not accepted by the target printer, since prior to configuring the target printer, Boldt queries whether the target printer supports the selected feature and value. Boldt thus does not disclose, teach, or suggest an invalid setting indication for each setting not accepted.

Claim 1 also recites, in part, querying said at least one target device for setting information based on each said invalid setting indication.

Boldt does not disclose, teach, or suggest querying a target printer for setting information based on each invalid setting indication. For example, Boldt does not disclose, teach, or suggest an invalid setting indication, as set forth above.

In addition, rather than querying at least one target device for setting information based on each invalid setting indication, Boldt discloses transmitting a query over the network to determine if the target printer supports both the selected feature and the source value for the selected feature (block 64), as a matter of course, and prior to any attempt to configure the target printer such as might otherwise generate an invalid setting indication, which does not disclose, teach, or suggest a query that is based on an invalid setting indication, but rather, a prior query that is for the purpose of determining if the target printer supports the selected feature and source value, without regard to an invalid setting indication within the context of Applicants' claimed invention.

Claim 1 further recites, in part, writing, for at least one of said each setting not accepted by said at least one target device, a value to said at least one target device, said value corresponding to said setting information.

Boldt does not disclose, teach, or suggest writing, for at least one of each setting not accepted by the at least one target device, a value to the at least one target device, the value corresponding to the setting information. Rather, Boldt discloses determining which features/values are supported, and then configuring the target printer with those features/values, without taking remedial actions if a setting is not supported, such as writing a value to the at least one target device, the value corresponding to the setting information, wherein the setting information is obtained by querying the target device based on an invalid setting indication, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Boldt does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. Claim 1 is thus believed allowable in its present form.

Claims 2-11 are believed allowable due to their dependence, directly or indirectly, on otherwise allowable base claim 1. In addition, claims 2-11 further and patentably define the invention over Boldt.

For example, claim 3 is directed to the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of retrieving an optimized list of source device settings from a location, wherein said writing said each setting includes writing said each setting according to said optimized list of source device settings.

Applicants respectfully submit that Boldt does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 3. Although the Examiner asserts that Boldt does so at column 9, lines 1-9, Applicants respectfully submit that the relied upon Boldt passage merely provides that after determining which of the values for the selected features are supported at the target printer, the computer configures the selected target printer with the values for the selected group of features that are available at the target printer.

Thus, the relied-upon passage does not disclose, teach, or suggest an retrieving an optimized list of source device settings, as recited in claim 3, but rather, discloses only that determining supported features and configuring the target printer with features that are available at the target printer, without any suggestion of an optimized list, much less, an optimized list of source device settings or retrieving an optimized list of source device settings, as recited in claim 3.

Accordingly, claim 3 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 4 is directed to the method of claim 3, wherein said optimized list of source device settings is based on a dependency of one of said each setting upon another of said each setting.

Applicants respectfully submit that Boldt does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 4, and that the relied-upon Boldt passage does not disclose, teach, or suggest any source device settings that are based on a dependency of one of each setting upon another of each setting. Rather, the relied-upon Boldt passage simply discloses determining supported features and configuring the target printer with features that are available at the target printer.

Accordingly, claim 4 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 5 is directed to the method of claim 1, further comprising the step of verifying an acceptance of said each setting by said at least one target device prior to said generating said invalid setting indication.

In contrast to verifying an acceptance of each setting by at least one target device prior to generating the invalid setting indication, i.e., verifying that the settings written to the target device are accepted, Boldt discloses first determining which features/values are supported, and then configuring the target printer with those features/values (col. 9, lines 3-8, Fig. 8), but without a subsequent step of verifying that the features/values were accepted by the target printer after the target printer was configured.

Accordingly, claim 5 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 6 is directed to the method of claim 1, wherein said source device transmits a program to a computer via said network, said computer having access to said at least one target device via said network, said program executing on said computer to perform said steps of said writing said each setting, said generating said invalid setting indication, said querying said at least one target device, and said writing said value.

Applicants respectfully submit that Boldt simply does not disclose, teach, or suggest wherein the source device transmits a program to a computer via the network that executes on the computer to perform the steps recited in claim 1 (writing, generating, querying, and then writing), as recited in claim 6.

Rather, Boldt discloses that the logic is implemented in an application program or operating system of the computer (col. 7, lines 55-58), without any reference to or otherwise

disclosing, teaching, or suggesting where the application program or operating system came from, much less from the source device, or that the source device transmits the program to the computer, as recited in claim 6.

Accordingly, claim 6 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 10 is directed to the method of claim 1, wherein said setting information includes a current target device setting.

In contrast to claim 10, Boldt discloses determining which features/values are supported, and then configuring the target printer with those features/values (col. 9, lines 3-8, Fig. 8), without any reference to a current target device setting.

Accordingly, claim 10 is believed allowable in its own right.

Claim 12 is directed to a computer readable storage device storing a set of computer executable instructions for implementing a method of establishing a plurality of target device settings for at least one target device based on a plurality of source device settings of a source device via a network, said method comprising the steps of: writing each setting of said plurality of source device settings to said at least one target device; generating an invalid setting indication for each setting not accepted by said at least one target device; querying said at least one target device for setting information based on each said invalid setting indication; and writing, for at least one of said each setting not accepted by said at least one target device, a value to said at least one target device, said value corresponding to said setting information.

Claim 12 is believed to be allowable in its present form for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 13-22 are believed allowable due to their dependence, directly or indirectly, on otherwise allowable base claim 12. In addition, claims 13-22 further and patentably define the invention over Boldt for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 2-11.

Claim 23 is directed to an imaging apparatus having a controller configured to execute computer executable instructions for implementing a method of establishing a plurality of target device settings for at least one target device based on a plurality of source device settings of a source device via a network, said method comprising the steps of: writing each setting of said plurality of source device settings to said at least one target device; generating an invalid setting indication for each setting not accepted by said at least one target device; querying said at least one target device for setting information based on each said invalid setting indication; and writing, for at least one of said each setting not accepted by said at least one target device, a value to said at least one target device, said value corresponding to said setting information.

Claim 23 is believed to be allowable in its present form for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 24-33 are believed allowable due to their dependence, directly or indirectly, on otherwise allowable base claim 23. In addition, claims 24-33 further and patentably define the invention over Boldt for substantially the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 2-11.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the cited reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter of the pending claims. The pending claims are therefore

in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of the claims.

In the event Applicants have overlooked the need for an extension of time, an additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicants hereby conditionally petition therefor and authorize that any charges be made to Deposit Account No. 20-0095, TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.

Should any question concerning any of the foregoing arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (317) 894-0801.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul C. Gosnell
Registration No. 46,735

Attorney for Applicants

RKA14/ts

TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.
12029 E. Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46229
Telephone: 317-894-0801
Facsimile: 317-894-0803

Electronically Filed: October 2, 2006